



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,008	01/30/2004	Norikazu Ninomiya	P07838US01/MP	5026
881	7590	01/26/2006		
STITES & HARBISON PLLC 1199 NORTH FAIRFAX STREET SUITE 900 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER HUNTER, ALVIN A	
			ART UNIT 3711	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Sp

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/767,008	NINOMIYA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Alvin A. Hunter	3711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 October 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 26,30 and 32-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 26,30,32 and 34-36 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 33 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jordan et al. (USPN 6835146).

Regarding claim 33, Jordan et al. discloses a method of manufacturing a multi-piece golf ball having a core, and intermediate layer, and a cover comprising a first process of molding the core having a spherical body and ribs arranged on the surface of the spherical body, a second process of forming an intermediate layer in a plurality of concave portions surrounded by the ribs wherein the intermediate layer has a thickness that is almost the same height of the rib, and a third process of providing a cover over the intermediate layer. Jordan et al. also discloses the second step comprising a process of compression molding a pair of hemispherical, shell like pieces for forming the intermediate layer wherein the pieces are composed of a rubber composition in a semi-vulcanized condition and a process in which the core is placed between the pair of pieces for forming the intermediate layer wherein the edges of the mouths of pair of the

pieces for forming the intermediate layer are fully vulcanized by compression molding so that the intermediate layer is formed. Though Jordan et al. does not explicitly disclose press molding, one skilled in the art is aware that compression molding is carrying out in the same fashion as that of press molding. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to use compression molding versus press molding because the processes are similar. Jordan et al. also discloses the material of the intermediate layer being made of diene polymer materials wherein the diene materials or elastomer wherein the vulcanization would not occur until placed within the mold. Furthermore, the mold used to form the ball of Jordan would inherently have two halves in order to receive the core before placement of the intermediate layer. Though not explicitly stated, having molds comprising two halves are common within the art.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 26, 30, 32, 34-36 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/13/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues with respect to claim 27 that Jordan does not teach the method of claim 27. The examiner disagrees. The applicant merely states that the process does not disclose a pair of pieces forming the mold. In response to the argument, the following questions should be asked:

- a) how is the intermediate layer of Jordan et al. formed;
- b) how is the ball of Jordan removed from the mold after press molding?

Art Unit: 3711

The mold obviously cannot be a one piece mold and as stated above, it is common within the art to utilize two piece molds having equal halves to form golf ball layers. Applicant should look at the references cited in the IDS to verify such and in particular, US patents 5836834, 6126560, and 5692973 cited in the IDS. For these reasons, the above rejection has been furnished.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alvin A. Hunter whose telephone number is (571) 272-4411. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30AM to 4:00PM Eastern Time.

Art Unit: 3711

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gene Kim, can be reached on 571-272-4463. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AAH
Alvin A. Hunter, Jr.



EUGENE KIM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER